DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 472 EA 020 259

AUTHOR Richardson, Sandra C.
TITLE The Principal: Gatekeeper of Change.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 38p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; *Administrator Effectiveness; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Leadership; *Occupational Information; *Principals; School Administration; *School Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

The role of the principal as the key decision-maker, problem-solver, and agent of change at the school site is discussed in this paper. A review of the recent literature indicates the major ways in which this role may be enhanced to bring about school effectiveness. The first section discusses the skills necessary to be a principal in today's schools. Most important are being able to work with teachers and to determine and appreciate their unique qualities, to innovate, to manage resources efficiently, and to serve as an instructional leader. Next, the conflicts inherent in the role of principal are outlined: the ambiguity of the tasks, the internal and external forces applying different pressures, and the budgetary restraints. Finally, the requirements necessary to implement real change are discussed. Levels of change, the obstacles that routinely inhibit change, some warnings of ways change may be ineffective, and suggestions for evaluating an individual school before beginning any changes are given. A current plan that places more emphasis on longer internships for principals, better graduate programs, and principal centers is also mentioned as a unified way to enhance principal preparation. In summary, while the student is the most important person in a school, that the principal plays a crucial factor in school effectiveness. The principal's role is difficult but not impossible, and it is this person's commitment to the job that will determine success. References are included. (LMS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297472

The Principal:

Gatekeeper of Change

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sandra C. Richardson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Sandra C. Richardson

Spring - 1987

East Tennessee State University

EA 020 259

The Principal: Gatekeeper of Change

"The most important person in a school is not the principal; it is the student most in need of individual attention to his needs as a learner. However, the person most able to provide the optimum combination of staff, resources, materials, and methods for that student is the school principal" (Chamberlin & Cote, 1972, p. 88).

Thus, the role of the elementary principal has emerged as a critical factor in school effectiveness (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). The principal is the key decision-maker, problem-solver, and agent of change at the school site (Morris, Crowson, Porter-Gehrie, & Hurwitz, 1984). The role of the principal is complex.

Ultimately, principal effectiveness is defined in terms of effects on student learning either directly or indirectly. The effective principal clearly has both short and long-term goals for students. These goals often center on "the basics" (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982).

Although not all inclusive, characteristics of effective principals have been discussed in many research studies. According to Jwaideh (1984), innovative principals (a) establish clear goals and priorities, (b) achieve a balance between task considerations and interpersonal relationships, (c) serve as role models for school norms, (d) communicate high expectations to teachers, (e) provide support and direction for

change, (f) gain support of the community and higher administration, (g) exhibit flexibility, (h) have more contacts and information sources outside the local area, (i) likely to have moved more often, (j) are more educated, (k) have more experience as administrators, and (l) have higher levels of interaction with other administrators.

Another study conducted by Rutherford, Hord, and Thurber (1984) revealed that effective principals exhibit certain skills. These skills include goal setting, active facilitation of change, and providing the assistance and monitoring needed to ensure that teachers can and do change. They reported that for many principals these were new skills and required changed roles.

According to Reilly (1984), Shoemaker and Fraser (1981) also studied effective principals. They emphasized principals' roles as school leaders. They found that the most effective principals stressed student achievement. These principals provided a calm school environment which was conducive to teaching and learning. They had high aspirations for their faculty and students. Furthermore, they developed instructional goals and means to evaluate such goals.

According to Leithwood and Montgomery (1982), the effective principals were oriented toward students, teachers, and the larger school system. Yet, the top priorities of effective principals were the achievement and happiness of their students. The effective principals saw themselves as

instructional leaders whose main function was to provide the best possible programs for the students. Therefore, the principals were directly involved with careful selections.

Other studies which concluded that principals make a difference in effective schooling, according to Sweeney (1982), included those by Edmonds (1976 and 1979), Brookover (1979), and Rutter (1979). From those studies, Sweeney summarized leadership behaviors and specific activities of principals that seem to make a positive impact. Principals made student achievement the top priority. Principals made the essential purpose of schools that of achievement. Some specific activities of effective principals included:

1. Frequent discussion of student achievement at faculty meetings.
2. Reduction of daily interruptions of classes.
3. Rewarding student achievements in assemblies and through exhibits.
4. Sharing achievement data with students, faculty, and community members.
5. Communicating the importance of student achievement to parents.

Among the many characteristics or traits of effective principals was that of concern for materials and resources in the classrooms (Leithwood and Montgomery, 1982). The typical principal was actively engaged with teachers in putting new curricula into practice. Other typical activities included

ordering and delivering supplies, arranging for space, scheduling planning sessions, disseminating information, arranging in-service training, planning with consultants, checking on teacher needs, and solving problems with the new curriculum. The effective principals were very knowledgeable about new curriculum (Hord, Stiegelbauer, and Hall, 1984). They gave attention to scope and sequence as well as to other aspects of the curriculum. Furthermore, they frequently evaluated pupil progress (Sweeney, 1982) so that revisions in the curriculum could be made when necessary.

Principals' effectiveness does stop at the classroom door. According to Leithwood and Montgomery (1982), effective principals matched teachers and students in relation to teaching and learning styles. These principals worked closely with teachers to identify classroom instructional priorities and means for their achievement. The principals made creative attempts to bring nonregular material and resources into the school. Furthermore, they worked directly with teachers in solving classroom problems that arose in the implementation of a new program. They helped teachers manage their time more efficiently by providing planning time outside of the instructional day.

In short, effective principals do more than manage schools. They do a great deal of work that directly involves teachers. Effective principals helped teachers with innovations (Hord, et al., 1984). About 50% of the elementary

principals in Leithwood and Montgomery's (1982) study attempted to assist in improving the instructional program. Effective principals demonstrated knowledge of both change processes and learning theory by consistently monitoring results and providing feedback (Sweeney, 1982).

A five-year study conducted at the University of Texas named five leadership skills of effective elementary and secondary principals. The skills included having a vision, translating the vision, providing a supportive environment, monitoring innovations, and intervening (Rutherford, 1985).

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) narrowed the list of leadership skills to three in relation to principal effectiveness. Their list included vision, initiative, and resourcefulness.

Until quite recently, the typical perception of the role of principals included that of administrator, manager, and public relations representative. However, effective school research has emphasized the importance of the principals' roles as instructional leaders (Hord, et al., 1984).

In several recent studies, effective principals were depicted as task-oriented rather than human relations-oriented (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Sweeney, 1982; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980). Their goal was to improve the school program. This did not preclude the establishment of good interpersonal relationships between principals and staff. In fact, "Lorzeau's (1977) data suggested that the effective

principal worked toward balanced attention to instructional leadership, routine administration, and human relations" (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982, p. 321).

Jwaideh's (1984) research findings indicated that the sensitivity of principals is positively related to the staff's tendency to innovate. Jwaideh also reported on a study conducted by Chester, Schmuck, and Lippitt. These researchers found that principals with innovative staffs were more in tune with their teachers' feelings and values about education. They were also better informed about their informal relationships and more professionally oriented.

Effective school research has had a great impact on administration during the past few years. However, some researchers are quick to point out problems that still exist with the principalship. For example,

> Research on effective schools has promoted the view that schools can be organized to improve instruction and that principals have a key role to play. Still, that optimism must be tempered by the knowledge that schools are loosely linked organizations where the impact of principals on instruction is limited. (Firestone & Wilson, 1985, p. 25)

According to Firestone and Wilson, cultural and bureaucratic linkages independently and interactively influenced the quality of instruction.

Another problem that still exists for principals is that of role conflict.

> Principals daily face pressures of competing images about what their role should be, and even the best have a difficult time maintaining an appropriate balance between the tasks of managing a smooth-running school and serving as a catalyst for and facilitator of instructional improvement. (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980, p. 9)

According to Sweeney (1982), principals do not have enough time for leadership roles because they are busy "being all things to all people" (p. 204). Furthermore, their administrator preparation prepared them to manage schools, personnel, and students instead of preparing them to lead.

Bennis (1976) wrote that people in leadership positions "are frustrated in their effort and cynical about how the society receive, distory, or subvert their initiatives" (p. v). He added that their visibility makes them vulnerable. In fact, the media intensifies their positions and their errors. Thus, they have lost autonomy when it comes to decision making. They are afraid to stand along for fear of human error. They must always be aware of internal and external constituencies. They must use power wisely.

In agreement with Bennis (1976), Jwaideh (1984) named the ambiguity of principals' roles and their authority as middle managers as major problems. Other difficulties of the job included increasing societal demands, such as (a) equal opportunity, (b) mainstreaming, (c) compensatory education,

(d) raising student achievement scores, and (e) returning to the basics.

As a result of these problems, "administrative leadership describes the dominant actions of most principals unsatisfactory by external agents and by majority of the elementary principals" (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982, p. 331). Typical principals initiated few changes in the school's instructional program. They were quite distant from curriculum and instructional decisions. Fewer than 50% of elementary school principals actively worked toward instructional improvement in their schools (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982).

Thus, Reilly (1984) suggested that principals should try to be school leaders instead of instructional leaders. According to Reilly, many studies indicated that principals spend little time in instructional leadership. Therefore, few elementary teachers see instructional leadership as the primary priority of principals. There is a problem with role image vs. actual job functions.

Reilly (1984) recommended that the principals' roles include three key functions: program planning and development, program implementation and improvements, and evaluating program effectiveness. He further added that the role of instructional leaders should belong to teachers since they were the experts on learning.

According to Leithwood and Montgomery (1982), ineffective principals were insufficiently assertive and unwilling to take

risks associated with changed classroom practices. They emphasized professional competence of teachers and wanted to leave them alone to teach. They did not engage staff in goal setting for students. There was a lack of achievement orientation in their schools. Curricular goals and priorities were not uniformly supported by the community.

In addition, Jwaideh (1984) reported that traditionally principals were only concerned with supervising and evaluating teachers. Their main goal was to maintain the smooth operation of the school. Thus, they attended to housekeeping chores and went to meetings with administrative personnel regarding rules and regulations. As a result, these principals were rewarded for maintaining the system. Thus, many principals were unlikely to challenge the status quo or to reward subordinates who did. In some systems, teachers were not used to their fullest potential by the principal in policy decision making (Turnage, 1972).

Chamberlin and Cote (1972) concluded that innovations abound in education--but so do apathy and administrative indecision. Whether principals are ready or not, education is in a state of change. Administrative leadership is crucial. "Current practice as a guide to better practice has more than enough deficiencies to caution the reader against prolonged study of the status quo. Still, to know where we are is helpful in charting a new and better course" (Harris, 1975, p. 104).

According to Turnage (1972), principals were the most appropriate people in the administrative hierarchy to function as change agents. Turnage said principals were in the best positions to be change agents because their roles and positions were transactional. Principals were exposed to the daily school operation. They were in middle positions between the school and the community. Thus, principals must perceive desirable objectives for their schools. They must help others contribute to their visions (Lucio & McNeil, 1969). Part of their role as instructional leaders includes lighting fires and stirring things up (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980).

In order to light fires and stir things up, principals should be aware of major leadership tasks in elementary and secondary schools. Doll (1972) named five leadership tasks for instructional leaders: (a) plotting directions for the school; (b) improving teaching, learning, and the curriculum; (c) improving the school as an organizational unit; (d) providing a climate for personal and professional growth; and (e) providing the best in human and material resources. Other necessary leadership tasks discussed by Doll included (a) seeking new ideas used in teaching, (b) discovering better applications of learning about children, (c) employing teachers insightfully, (d) conferring with individuals to improve their learning, (e) providing useful in-service programs, and (f) developing improved evaluation systems.

Reilly (1986) looked at two viewpoints of leadership. First that of Lipham: Leadership was considered to be the initiation of a new procedure used to change an organization's goals and objectives. Secondly, the viewpoint of Machiavelli: "There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things" (p. 421-422).

Yet, school change and improvement is often brought about by principals (Jwaideh, 1984). In fact, the "primary responsibility for change rests with the principal" (Lipham, Hoeh, & Rankin, 1985, p. 118). No major changes occur without the support of the principals. The locus for important educational change is in the local schools (Lipham, et al., 1985).

Change occurs when there is acceptance and spread of an innovation (Lucio & McNeil, 1969). Jwaideh (1984) reported the results of research on the improvement process which was conducted at the Research and Development Center at the University of Texas, Austin. The researchers found that the attitudes and actions of principals made a difference in the success of change projects.

Another such study by Berman and McLaughin in 1975 (ERS Report, 1982) observed the principal' active support of a change project. They found that principals who became actively involved in innovated projects increased the chances of teacher

change and the perceived success of the project. Thus, school principals played a central role in the success of change. The principals' support was crucial for program continuation. Berman and McLaughin concluded that "the principal amply merits the title of gatekeeper of change" (Jwaideh, 1984, p. 10).

Another study reported in ERS (1982) relating to principals' roles in change was conducted by Mahan in 1970. Mahan sampled teachers concerning principals' roles in innovative programs. The teachers ranked principals as leading initiators of innovations in the school districts.

However, Fuhr (1970) reported that elementary principals developed fewer than one half of the innovations in their buildings (ERS Report, 1982). Fuhr found that leadership styles, productive thinking, school climate, and teachers' age related to innovative practices. Teachers' age related most significantly. The older teachers were less innovative.

Wyant and coauthors reported that principals were important facilitators of the change process (ERS, 1982). Innovative administrators had the willingness to alter their own behavior to accommodate changes in the behavior of others. They actively supported new projects. They were actively committed to seeing projects through. According to Jwaideh (1984), Clark found that the success of new organizational innovations was associated with administrators who had good knowledge of organizational science.

In 1973, Rabin's research indicated that elementary principals' roles were significantly related to innovations in curriculum (ERS Report, 1982). Principals were more concerned with improving curriculum than some other areas.

Many studies emphasized the principals' roles in change. However, Ganz and Hoy (1977) reported that elementary principals hired from outside a school district were more likely to enact change than those principals hired from inside (ERS Report, 1982). In addition, Jwaideh (1984) said that Griffiths indicated that change was more likely to take place if the successor to the chief administrator was from outside the organization. Griffiths further added that there was a negative relationship between the principals' tenure and the number of innovative changes introduced.

Johnson and Sloan (1977) also found that one of the main roles of principals should be that of change agents (ERS Report, 1981). They found that principals who did serve as change agents adhered to participatory management, tended to have more experience as principals, were more likely to report employing paid teacher aides, communicated effectively, and used a variety of thrust behaviors to move the organization.

According to Ingram (1980), principals should assure executive authority. They should work on three main areas of change: attitudes, skills (managerial), and functions. Principals must initiate change. "Change is the very essence of educational leadership" (Sweeney, 1980, p. 6).

"Change, or program improvement, is defined as the realization of valued outcome by students. Change process is conceptualized as a complex form of individual and organizational learning, resocialization, or growth" (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982, p. 309-310). Thus, research completed by Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) revealed that principals wanted continuous change in programs to better meet the needs of students. The principals also had high expectations for teachers, students, and themselves.

Principals should be expected to promote both continuity and change (Harris, 1985). According to Firestone and Wilson (1985), some improvements in instructional practices evolve over time.

Change per se is not good. Frequent change is not always better. "Change simply for the sake of change is counter-productive" (Lipham et al., 1985, p. 107).

However, change is not always planned even though it is preferred (Harris, 1985). According to Bennis, Benne, and Chin (1964), "Planned change entails mutual goal setting by one or both parties, an equal power-ratio, and deliberateness, eventually at least on the part of both sides" (p. 154).

Bennis et al. (1964) noted that there are several kinds of change. Their list included indoctrination, coercive, technocratic, interactional, socialization, emulative, and natural. Indoctrination suggests deliberate and mutual goal setting, but it involves an inbalanced power ratio. Many

schools, prisons, and hospitals fall into this category. Coercive change involves nonmutual goal setting, an inbalanced power-ratio, and one-sided deliberateness. Technocratic change involves bringing about change solely by collecting and interpreting data. Interactional change involves mutual goal setting, fairly equal power distribution, and no deliberateness on either side of the relationship. Socialization change has a direct relationship with the interactional hierarchical framework. An example is parent-child relationships or teacher-child. Emulative change is the process associated with formal organizations. There are clear cut relationships, such as superior-subordinate. Lastly, natural change involves no apparent deliberateness and no goal setting on the part of those involved in it.

Lipham et al. (1985) names similar general orientations toward change. They included empirical-rational view, normative-reeducative view, and power-coercive view. The impirical-rational view involves obtaining commitment by bringing about fundamental changes in attitudes and values. The power-coercive view emphasizes the use of sanctions (political, economical, or social) to modify individual or group behavior. According to Lipham et al., most educational changes include various combinations of these orientations.

Harris (1985) identified several types of change. His change list included the following: planned, functional,

personnel, physical, rules, and organizational. He said organizational changes were the most widely used.

Furthermore, Harris (1985) added that all changes involve either dynamic or tractive leadership. Dynamic leaders want changes that include upgrading, restructuring, or redesigning instructional programs or practices. Whereas, tractive leaders want minor changes in the program. Some continuity is essential.

Lipham et al. (1985) discussed three types of changes identified by Getzels (1973). Getzels names the three types of change as enforced, expedient, and essential. Enforced changes were major changes from outside the organization, not from leadership within. The expedient changes create pressures for altering the internal system. They often set off a chain of counter pressures. Essential changes are creative transformations. They are based on commitment and principles. The principals' leadership is vital in this type of change.

Jwaideh (1984) said that effectively implementing innovations that were mandated was the principals' responsibilities. Jwaideh offered these suggestions for principals: (a) involve teachers to maximum extent in planning the implementation; (b) provide necessary materials and resources; (c) make necessary changes in organizational arrangements if needed; (d) keep parents and community fully informed about purposes, nature, and consequences of innovations; (e) hold regular meetings with involved teachers;

(f) help teachers realize the project is theirs; (g) involve teachers in program evaluations; (h) provide feedback; (i) encourage individuals to express their doubts and negative feelings, and (j) "kill a project when it has outlived its usefulness" (Jwaideh, 1984, p. 13). The more involvement that principals can get, the better chance of success they will have in implementing mandatory changes. They must obtain support and commitment to change objectives.

Individuals accept change for different reasons. Lipham et al. (1985) said that some principals are motivated to change to gain recognition as early adapters of new programs. Other principals promote change to take advantage of specialized resources or grants. "Thus, competition between and among schools is an underestimated force for significant change" (p. 119).

Principals must be aware of the phases of change as well as the reasons for change. Lipham et al., (1985) discussed the different phases of change. The phases presented were awareness, initiation, implementation, routinization, refinement, renewal, and evaluation.

According to Glickman (1985), teachers think of innovations in three levels: orientation, integration, and refinement. During the orientation concerns, teachers are interested in the answers to what and why. Then during the integration concerns, they want to know how to implement the innovations. Hopefully, teachers will experience refinement

concerns at this point; they search for ways to make innovations even better. During these three levels, teachers need much support from their principals. This is not an easy process for principals or teachers. As Hechinger (1976) said, "Trying to bring about changes in education has been compared to moving a cemetery" (p. 26).

There are many barriers for change. Carlson identified three barriers for the slow rate of change in schools: absence of a change agent, a weak knowledge base, and domestication of the public school (Knezevich, 1984).

According to Hechinger (1976), there is never anything new in education. Most ideas in education are borrowed rather than invented (Lucio & McNeil, 1969). Attempts were made to use closed-circuit television, teaching machines, team teaching, open classrooms, vouchers, and performance contracts. However, as Cogan (1973) noted, innovations are not critically examined before adoption. This results in educational fads that fade (Tanner, 1984). Innovations are seldom tested. They are promoted.

Innovations often fail because they are given to teachers to implement without necessary resources and training (Cogan, 1973). According to Cogan, sporadic classroom visits and global comments will not be enough to help teachers. "Teachers are better left alone than merely tampered with" (p. 15).

Innovations that threaten traditional values of individuals or the group receive greater resistance to change

(Knezevick, 1984). Most individuals are conservative and seek security. They resist change almost instinctively (Marks, Stoops, & Stoops, 1971). According to Lewin's quasi-stationary equalibrium theory, individuals possess driving forces. One force impels an individual to change; whereas, the other force, of equal strength, inhibits change (Alfonso, Firth, & Neville, 1975). Thus, Alfonso et al. reported that according to Mort, principals should consider the time, money, and energy involved in innovations. Changes progress more slowly the higher the costs.

Many barriers make change difficult in education. Yet, principals have the key role in managing the change process (Jwaideh, 1984). Some of the obstacles that principals face with the change process include lack of knowledge and skill, disincentives, inappropriate organizational arrangement, and lack of material resources. Often, principals have to work with teachers who have limited knowledge and skills in new practices. Teachers' backgrounds of professional training also vary. The principals are often faced with those disincentives where teachers are not motivated to change. Teachers often resist changing to new programs and to participating in in-service training (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982).

Other obstacles principals face in promoting change include the perceptions that the teachers have of their principals. Teachers often perceive principals to be distant

factors from daily classroom lives (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982).

Furthermore, problems in the change process occur because principals have inherently ambiguous and complex roles. Some principals deal ineffectively with change. Their ineffectiveness may be the result of limited or incorrect perceptions of the whole educational system, lack of knowledge about the change process, inability to assess student needs, or lack of general leadership skills (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). According to Sarason, "An important factor shaping the principal's view of his role in the system is the degree to which he feels he, rather than external factors, will govern the course of his action" (Jwaideh, 1984, p. 9).

Ineffectiveness in the change process may also be attributed to other factors. Some of these factors include ambiguous educational goals, political or popular innovations, lack of interdependence among members of school organizations, loosely coupled systems, or lack of formal organizational complexity (Jwaideh, 1984, Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982).

Another short coming of principals, according to Chamberlin and Cote (1972) was the avoidance of the human variable. They said principals find it easier to deal with things instead of people.

The continuation of a change project depends a great deal on the principal. Major change projects in schools were discontinued when the principals leave (Lipham, et al., 1985).

That is the reason that principals must get the whole staff actively involved in the initial awareness phase and throughout the total change process. Bennis (1976) said that "leaders can sometimes serve best by departing" (p. vii).

Lipham et al. (1985) also noted that a study conducted by Klausmeier in 1978 concluded that "administrators and teachers accept as authentic that which works in other schools. However, caution should be taken not to adopt a 'monkey see, monkey do' mentality" (p. 118). Principals must examine programs very carefully. The same program will not work in every locale.

Another word of wisdom was offered by Marks et al. (1971). They stated, "Many good ideas, which should have worked, have failed miserably because they were put into effect too quickly" (p. 80). Implementation of major changes take time. Lipham et al. (1985) reported on Neimer's 1978 study. Neimer found that many innovations failed because they were rushed, lack of community support, or not enough money. Neimer said start-up funds are necessary for implementing innovations. Lipham et al. (1985) added that "most major educational changes take several years, not months" (p. 119). Furthermore, the success rate of innovations could be increased with adequate, appropriate, and systematic in-service training.

Other warnings for principals came from Harris (1985). Harris cautioned about falling for the three administrative fallacies. The administrative fallacy is things are going

well, without friction, and through proper channels. The white-hat fallacy is if there are some positive results, everything is fine and successful. The moral-building fallacy is morale must be either steady or improving. Downward fluctuations in morale are not desirable.

Yet, in spite of all the obstacles or barriers to change, many principals are very successful. "The ability to lead--rather than to push or dictate--is the quality--that today's principal needs most for success" (Chamberlin & Cote, 1972, p. 96). Principals must realize that people resist being forced to change; therefore, they must find ways to actively involve teachers. "Concentration of power at the top of an organization does not necessarily result in maximum performance" (Jwaideh, 1984, p. 14). Organizational effectiveness is enhanced by shared decision making. Principals must be in tune with social achievement and power needs of their staff. "One of the keys to an organization's success is the proximity of its leader to the scene of the action" (Ingram, 1980, p. 21).

For principals to become effective change agents, they must perceive the need for change and develop a strategy to gain change (Turnage, 1972). According to Benne, change agents intervene to influence direction, tempo, and quality of change (Turnage, 1972). Turnage added that effective change agents develop a rationale for change, clearly define goals, and know

resources. Furthermore, their approach to change is positive, firm, and objective.

Turnage (1972) listed the goals of change agents according to Bennis. The list included the following:

1. To creat an open, problem-solving climate throughout the organization.
2. To supplement authority associated with role and status with authority of knowledge and competence.
3. To locate decision making and problem solving as close to information sources as possible.
4. To build trust among persons and groups.
5. To make competition more relevant to work goals and to maximize collaborative effort.
6. To develop a reward system which recognized organizational and individual needs.
7. To increase sense of ownership of organization.
8. To help managers manage according to relevant objectives rather than past practices.
9. To increase self-control and self-direction for people within the organization. (pp. 30-31)

According to Dewey's scientific method, when principals plan for change, they must go through certain steps to manage change effectively. These steps include becoming aware of the problem, clarifying the problem, evaluating proposed solutions, and experimental verification (Alfonso, et al., 1975).

There are different approaches to educational change. Lipham et al. (1985) described four approaches: problem-solving, social interaction, research-development, linkage models of change. When using the problem-solving approach, principals look for logical approaches for change. An example of the social interaction approach is the diffusion of agricultural innovations. The research-development approach involves two key concepts: diffusion and utilization. With this approach, there is a downward view in which changes flow--from their sources to users. The fourth approach identified by Lipham et al., linkage models of change, views change as reciprocal. The principals who use this approach establish communication networks between the sources and the users of the innovation through a linkage agent.

In addition to deciding which approach is appropriate for change, principals must look at the scope of change. The scope of change affects its success. Thus, principals should look at the complexity of comprehensiveness of a change and the size of the social system in which the innovation will take place. Simple changes are often easily installed. However, major change programs often entail changes within changes (Lipham et al., 1985).

The success of educational change varies. "The value assigned to a change tends to be determined by the directions, quality, rate, and side effects that characterize the change" (Harris, 1985, p. 21). There are several things that have an

impact on the successful implementation of change. Lipham et al. (1985) reported the findings of Goodridge (1975), Howes, (1974), and Paul, (1974). These researchers concluded that the following had an impact on the principals' ability to implement change:

1. The quality of the change program itself.
2. The extent to which the change program addresses goals and needs.
3. The perceived advantages of the change.
4. The degree of staff understanding of the attempted change program.
5. The extent to which the program was nonthreatening.
6. The divisibility of the program into manageable parts.
7. The program's successful implementation in other schools.
8. Evaluative data showing the effects of the change. (p. 120)

Furthermore, Jwaideh (1984) concluded that principals must consider the characteristics of their schools when planning change. Principals should evaluate the school's vulnerability to the environment. Other factors which must be considered include domestication of schools and the lack of competition among them, goal ambiguity, organizational structure and roles, climate of the school, community patterns, and the ways in which decisions are made.

Of the above factors, Jwaideh (1984) said that organizational climate was the most important concern in initiating and sustaining change. The climate has significant influence on teacher and student performance. An atmosphere of guidance and encouragement fosters creativity and innovation. Thus, "the creation of a healthy climate for change is the most important contribution the principal can make" (p. 13).

There are guidelines that principals can usually follow when improving the educational system. These guidelines strive to make principals better leaders. A leadership guideline for principals proposed by Jwaiden (1984) included the following: (a) goal-setting, (b) data gathering, (c) improving communications, (d) managing motivation, (e) stimulating creativity, (f) providing information and training, (g) involving teachers in decision making, (h) increasing interdependence among staff members, (i) creating linkages, and (j) implementing innovations.

Even though principals have the crucial roles of leadership in their schools, they do not bear the weight alone (Hord, et al., 1984). They are often assisted by assistant principals, special teachers, or area level or district level specialists. According to Bennis (1976), for principals to function properly, they need an "executive constellation--no means an abdication of responsibility--it is a way of multiplying executive power through a realistic allocation of

effort" (p. 135). Principals must get the necessary information; yet, scanners and sensors are extremely important.

In the 1982 ERS Report, Wyant and others identified principals' behaviors that were helpful in initiating and sustaining externally funded change projects. The prerequisites for successful project management were:

1. Somebody has to have energy for the project.
2. Effective management depends on a good match between the principal's style and the staff's expectations.
3. Principal changes roles during the life of a project--believer, advocater, linker, resource acquirer, employer, leader, manager, delegator, supporter, and information source. (p. 39)

Even though principals play a very important role in the change process, they are not the source of all innovative ideas. The 1982 ERS Report showed the main sources of ideas for innovations in Jarvis' 1970 study were college courses, 23%; local workshops, 18%; and teachers and peers, 18%. This study surveyed elementary principals in Georgia.

Another study, Ruff and Orlich (1977), surveyed elementary principals on their main source of ideas for innovations (ERS Report, 1982). They most frequently cited textbook salesmen or publishers in both social studies and sciences. District curriculum coordinators were the second source most freequently cited.

The ERS Report (1982) also included a survey done by The National Association of Elementary School Principals. The population of this study was also elementary principals. These principals were asked to name the main source of ideas for innovation during the past three years that resulted in significant changes of practice in their schools. The results were other principals and teachers, 23.3%; professional reading, 18.9%; local workshops, 16.1%; outside consultants, 9.5%; college courses, 9.4%; central office staff, 9.3%; state conferences, 7.3%; national conferences, 3.7%; and parents and other community contacts, 2.5%.

In short, principals must be aware of and open to many sources of innovations. They must also know the motivations for change (Kaiser, 1985), time required, financial resources, community support, how to train staff, and the quality of the change program. Principals need to understand and have skills in implementing change so that school can become more effective. Yet, "despite considerable study of educational change, there still is no general and overarching theory of change, just as there is no comprehensive theory of administration" (Lipham et al., 1985, p. 106).

For a person preparing for a principalship, Jentz, Cheever, and Fisher (1980) offered this insight: "Getting off to good start in a new principalship requires getting good information about people, programs, the system, and the community; and it requires using that information wisely in

making decisions and taking action" (p. 23). They also offered the following advice:

1. Be aware of the "jump reflex." This helpful action is an expression of the principals' need to prove themselves useful in their new job.
2. Be aware of the "should, ought, and must voice" within yourself. New principals often try to shape the world of their new jobs to fit the "should" picture in their minds.
3. Remember that confusion is inescapeable and natural. Use confusion assertively to inquire and learn.
4. Don't try to be a "finished product" on entering your new job. Enter as a learner.

New principals must strive to meet the cardinal rule: "Lead, not manage" (Bennis, 1976, p. 27). There is an important difference. According to Bennis (1976), leadership is a craft and a science. Thus, "the main instrument or tool for the leader-as-craftsman is himself" (p. vi). Therefore, principals must learn their own strengths and skills and develop them to the utmost.

The future training of principals is extremely important to improving the whole educational system. Jwaideh (1984) reported that Goldhammer proposed that in the future training of principals less than one third of the time should be spent on knowledge building. Goldhammer suggested that more than one third of the training program take place in laboratory-type

situations. Goldhammer proposed that the following skills are needed by the educational administrator:

1. Knowledge of the technology of building a healthy school organization.
2. Skills of diagnosis, including selection and analysis of relevant data.
3. Ability to interpret and apply these data.
4. Ability to develop and implement the strategies and interventions necessary to achieve a more healthy and effective organization. (p. 15)

More and more emphasis is being placed on longer internships and principal centers to improve educational leadership. Reilly (1984) called for better graduate programs, full-time internships, and a minimum of two years full-time study.

In addition, Rutherford et al. (1984) concluded that principal training programs have been meager thus far. They reported that principals have the specifics of what is needed for the ultimate goal of effectiveness, but additional training is needed to help them reach that goal. They added that training programs should attend to the concerns that principals have about their roles as facilitators of school improvement. They found that too many training programs focused on consequences or impact.

Jwaideh (1984) also called for a move away from the traditional administrative preparation programs. Jwaideh

suggested that today's education leaders draw from all of the humanities, business, and any other useful discipline.

Sweeney, Hutch, and Engel (1981) concluded that internships were seen as the ultimate vehicle for principal preparation. Sweeney et al. looked at the highly structural intern program for training secondary school principals set up by NASSP. The objective of the project was to produce educational leaders or change agents. "The results do not substantiate that the program produced more effective change agents, but participants' perceptions of training were more positive" (p. 151). The results indicated that principals who had the internship were more confident in their leadership ability. The results also indicated that leadership skills could be emphasized without affecting proficiency in other administrative areas. Thus,

> in the absence of empirical evidence supporting other training methodologies, producing principals who feel they are more effective educational leaders may be a goal on which to build. The internship does seem more likely to produce administrators who feel capable of producing change, and it seems logical that those who feel capable may ultimately be more successful. (p. 45)

In summary, the most important person in a school is the student. Yet, the principal is the crucial factor in school effectiveness (Chamberlin & Cote, 1972). The principal is the key decision maker, problem solver, and agent of change at the

school site (Morris et al., 1984). The principal has a difficult, but not impossible, task. The key to success is commitment (Sweeney, 1982). "It takes a unique person to help give a school, first, an image of what it can be and, second, to provide the drive, support, and skills to make that image approximate reality" (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980, p. viii).

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Alfonso, R. J., Firth, G. R., & Neville, R. F. (1975). Instructional Supervision: A Behavior System. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bennis, W. (1976). The Unconscious Conspiracy: Why Leaders Can't Lead. New York: American Management Association.

Bennis, W. G., Benne, K. D., & Chin, R. (1964). The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Chamberlin, L. J., & Cote, R. R. (1972). Administration, Education and Change. Iowa: Kendall/Hunt.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.

Doll, R. C. (1972). Leadership to Improve Schools. Ohio: Charles A. Jones.

ERS Executive Staff Report. (1982). The Role of Elementary School Principals: A Summary of Research. (Prepared by A. W. Block). Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Firestone, W. A., & Wilson, B. L. (1985, Spring). Using bureaucratic and cultural linkages to improve instruction: The principal's contribution. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21, 7-30.

Harris, B. M. (1975). Supervisory Behavior in Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Hechinger, F. M. (1976, September-October). Where have all the innovations gone? Today's Education, 65, 80-83, 125.

Hord, S. M., Stiegelbauer, S. M., & Hall, G. E. (1984, November). How principals work with other change facilitators. Education and Urban Society, 17, 89-109.

Ingram, R. L. (1980, March). How to be your school's chief executive. National Elementary Principal, 59, 21-23.

Jentz, B. C., Cheever, D. S., & Fisher, S. B. (1980, March). How to survive your first year: A guide for new principals. National Elementary Principal, 59, 23-26.

Jwaideh, A. R. (1984, Fall). The principal as a facilitator of change. Educational Horizons, 63, 9-15.

Kaiser, J. S. (1985). The Principalship. Minnesota: Burgess.

Knezevich, S. J. (1984). Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper & Row.

Leithwood, K. A., & Montgomery, D. J. (1982, Fall). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, 52, 309-339.

Lipham, J. M., Rankin, R. E., & Hoeh, J. A., Jr. (1985). The Principalship: Concepts, Competencies, and Cases. New York: Longman.

Lucio, W. H., & McNeil, J. D. (1969). Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Marks, J. R., Stoops, E., & Stoops, J. K. (1971). Handbook of Educational Supervision: A Guide for the Practitioner. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Morris, V. C., Crowson, R. L., Porter-Gehrie, C., & Hurwitz, E., Jr. (1984). Principals in Action: The Reality of Managing Schools. Ohio: Bell & Howell.

Reilly, D. H. (1984, Spring). The principalship: The need for a new approach. Education, 104, 242-247.

Reilly, D. H. (1986, Summer). Educational Leadership: The Missing Element. Education, 106, 421-428.

Rutherford, W. L. (1985, September). School principals as effective leaders. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 31-34.

Rutherford, W. L., Hord, S. M., & Thurber, J. C. (1984, November). Preparing principals for leadership roles in school improvement. Education and Urban Society, 17, 29-48.

Sweeney, J. (1980, June). Training educational leaders as change agents: The effect of the internship. Educational Technology, 20, 42-45.

Sweeney, J. (1982, Winter). Principals can provide instructional leadership: It takes commitment. Education, 103, 204-207.

Sweeney, J., Huth, L., & Engle, R. (1981, Winter). Principal internships: A look at the facts. Education, 102, 151-153.

Tanner, D. (1984, March). The American high school at the crossroads. Educational Leadership, 41, 4-13.

Turnage, M. (1972). The Principal: Change-Agent in Desegregation. Illinois: Integrated Education Associates.